

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

February 7, 2006 LB 874

Kremer a question, if I may.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Kremer, would you yield to a question from Senator Chambers?

SENATOR KREMER: Yes, I will.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Kremer, could subdivision (e), which we're looking at, be left intact as it exists now, then put in a separate subdivision that would make it clear that if you're talking about these adverse effects on humans or the environment, there would be no possibility of there being a suggestion or even an argument that a change as far as ground and surface water are concerned? Here's the question now. Why could not this new language be made a separate subdivision?

SENATOR KREMER: Well, I think it could, but if you'll look at the beginning of part (e) there, it says the state management plan and pesticide management plan may impose. It's really talking about when we start a state management plan. There are two kinds of plans--the state management plan and a state...what's the other, pesticide management plan. This is just saying when we can start, what we need to have a reason for to start the state management plan, and it's not intended to weaken at all the effects on the ground water, but it's to include it that a plan should be put into place when we see adverse effects on human or environment also. I have no problem making sure that we don't weaken the water part of it, but to me it says...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then...

SENATOR KREMER: Go ahead.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then suppose, since you want that language, "the state management plan and pesticide management plans," without maybe having to repeat that, you would move this new language to the end of section...of this subdivision, and on page 17...now, I'm flying by the seat of my britches on this one, but to get the idea across, there could be left intact subdivision (e). Then, after "Licensure," you might add that